Kochen-Specker theorem as a precondition for secure quantum key distribution

Koji Nagata
National Institute of Information and Communications Technology,
4-2-1 Nukuikita, Koganei, Tokyo 184-8795, Japan
(Dated: February 1, 2008)

We show that (1) the violation of the Ekert 91 inequality is a sufficient condition for certification of the Kochen-Specker (KS) theorem, and (2) the violation of the Bennett-Brassard-Mermin 92 (BBM) inequality is, also, a sufficient condition for certification of the KS theorem. Therefore the success in each QKD protocol reveals the nonclassical feature of quantum theory, in the sense that the KS realism is violated. Further, it turned out that the Ekert inequality and the BBM inequality are depictured by distillable entanglement witness inequalities. Here, we connect the success in these two key distribution processes into the no-hidden-variables theorem and into witness on distillable entanglement. We also discuss the explicit difference between the KS realism and Bell's local realism in the Hilbert space formalism of quantum theory.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Dd, 03.65.Ud, 03.67.Mn

arXiv:quant-ph/0503158v2 23 May 2005

Quantum key distribution (QKD) allows the participants (Alice and Bob) to wish to agree on a secret key about which no eavesdropper can obtain significant information, by the properties of quantum theory [1]. There are many researches related to the security of QKD schemes [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. Especially, the connection between entanglement, which is a resource of various quantum information processes [6, 7], and the success in QKD has been discussed flourishingly [3, 4, 5].

As for the connection between no-hidden-variables theorem and the success in QKD, in 1991, Ekert proposed [8] a QKD protocol based on Bell's theorem [9] using Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) correlation. Ekert discussed the success in his QKD process in cryptography depends on the completeness of quantum theory by invoking Bell's theorem. However, in 1992, Bennett, Brassard and Mermin showed [10] that Bell's theorem is not an essential part of successful QKD protocols. They proposed a simple QKD protocol (BBM protocol) using the EPR correlation, without invoking Bell's theorem to detect an eavesdropper's listening. And they discussed that the BBM protocol is, essentially, equivalent to the well known BB84 scheme. They concluded that the EPR effect is superficial for successful QKD protocols by invoking the BB84 protocol, which uses single particles instead of the EPR correlation.

One can see the success in each protocol is certified by violations of their (Ekert and BBM) inequalities, respectively, because of coexistence with the recent researches [3, 4, 5]. To explain detail, we shall introduce a quantum state which has convenient property. Please note that there is a quantum state, on which simulates the actual measured random bits by single-copy measurements [3, 4]. We shall call such a state the *candidate* state for short. One will then see the success in each of EPR-type-QKD protocols (Ekert 91 and BBM 92), in terms of violations of their inequalities, implies that the candidate state can not be a separable state. The candidate state must have the fidelity (more than half) to the EPR state. Thereby, the candidate state is necessarily a distillable entangled state in two qubits systems [11]. This point coexists with recent arguments in [3, 4, 5].

In this paper, we connect the success in each protocol (Ekert 91 and BBM 92) into the no-hidden-variables theorem, using the EPR effect. We show that (1) the success in the Ekert protocol reveals the nonclassical property of quantum theory, and (2) the success in the BBM protocol, also, reveals the nonclassical property of quantum theory. One can see the nonclassical property of quantum theory is certified by the Kochen-Specker (KS) theorem [12] as well as Bell's theorem [13].

We will see the simple BBM protocol can be seen to be equivalent to the Ekert protocol in the sense that the criterion of the success depends on the fidelity to the EPR correlation. That is, the fidelity to the EPR correlation, which is more than half, gives secret-key distillability. This allows explicit construction of inequalities valid for the KS realism. The violation of the KS type of realism is a necessary condition for certification of the success in each of QKD schemes (Ekert 91 and BBM 92), introducing the candidate state. Thereby, one connects the success in each of QKD protocols into the no-hidden-variables theorem. Finally, we shall discuss the situations in which the violation of their (Ekert and BBM) inequalities in each of QKD protocols does not invalidate Bell's local realism.

Let us start analyzing the Ekert inequality and the BBM inequality. Let ρ be the candidate state which simulates the actual measured correlation by single-copy of itself. The Ekert inequality is as follows:

$$|E_\rho(a_1b_1) - E_\rho(a_1b_3) + E_\rho(a_3b_1) + E_\rho(a_3b_3)| \leq \sqrt{2}. \quad (1)$$

Here, $E_\rho(o)$ represents an expectation value ($E_\rho(o) = tr[\rho o]$, o is a quantum observable). Ekert chose the measurement observables as $a_1 = \sigma_x^a$, $a_3 = \sigma_y^a$, $b_1 = \frac{\sigma_y^b + \sigma_x^b}{\sqrt{2}}$, and $b_3 = \frac{\sigma_y^b - \sigma_x^b}{\sqrt{2}}$, where σ_l^a and σ_l^b ($l = x, y, z$) are the Pauli observables with respect to Alice and Bob, respectively. Hence, (1) is rewritten by

$$|E_\rho(\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b) + E_\rho(\sigma_y^a\sigma_y^b)| \leq 1. \quad (2)$$

We shall show that the violation of this inequality implies that the candidate state has the fidelity to the EPR state, which is more than half. We notice that $tr[\rho\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b] + tr[\rho\sigma_y^a\sigma_y^b] = 2tr[\rho(|\Psi^+\rangle\langle\Psi^+| - |\Psi^-\rangle\langle\Psi^-|)]$ with $|\Psi^+\rangle = \frac{|+^a-^b\rangle+|-^a+^b\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $|\Psi^-\rangle = \frac{|+^a-^b\rangle-|-^a+^b\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$. Here, $\sigma_z^a|\pm^a\rangle = \pm|\pm^a\rangle$ and $\sigma_z^b|\pm^b\rangle = \pm|\pm^b\rangle$. Therefore, if (1) is violated, we have $\langle\Psi^+|\rho|\Psi^+\rangle > \frac{1}{2}$ or $\langle\Psi^-|\rho|\Psi^-\rangle > \frac{1}{2}$. Hence, the fidelity ($> 1/2$) to the EPR state ($|\Psi^+\rangle$ or $|\Psi^-\rangle$) is established if (1) is violated. It is well known that this condition is sufficient to ρ be a distillable entangled state since ρ is a two qubits state.

Let us derive the original Ekert's form written in [8]. Assume that the correlation is disturbed (or replaced) by eavesdroppers. Imagine the candidate state ρ can be any separable state written by

$$\rho = \int p(n^a, n^b) dn^a dn^b \rho^a \otimes \rho^b, \tag{3}$$

where $\rho^a = \frac{1}{2}(I + n^a \cdot \sigma^a)$ and $\rho^b = \frac{1}{2}(I + n^b \cdot \sigma^b)$. Here, $\sigma^a = (\sigma_x^a, \sigma_y^a, \sigma_z^a), \sigma^b = (\sigma_x^b, \sigma_y^b, \sigma_z^b)$ and I represents the identity operator. The normalized measure $p(n^a, n^b)$ and unit vectors n^a, n^b virtually represent strategy of the eavesdroppers. Let us introduce $\vec{a}_k$ and $\vec{b}_k$ $(k = 1, 3)$ such that $\vec{a}_k \cdot \sigma^a = a_k$ and $\vec{b}_k \cdot \sigma^b = b_k$. Let S be

$$S = tr[a_1 b_1 \rho] - tr[a_1 b_3 \rho] + tr[a_3 b_1 \rho] + tr[a_3 b_3 \rho]. \tag{4}$$

Since $\{a_1, a_3\} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\{b_1, b_3\} = \mathbf{0}$ hold, the upper bound of $|S|$ is $\sqrt{2}$ [14] when ρ is any separable state. On substituting (3) into (4) and performing some algebra we find that

$$\begin{aligned} S = &\int p(n^a, n^b) dn^a dn^b \\ &((\vec{a}_1 \cdot n^a)(\vec{b}_1 \cdot n^b) - (\vec{a}_1 \cdot n^a)(\vec{b}_3 \cdot n^b) \\ &+(\vec{a}_3 \cdot n^a)(\vec{b}_1 \cdot n^b) + (\vec{a}_3 \cdot n^a)(\vec{b}_3 \cdot n^b)). \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

This leads us to the original form of the Ekert inequality. Thereby, we see that the Ekert inequality is a distillable entanglement witness inequality.

Let us move to the BBM inequality, which is as follows:

$$|E_\rho(\sigma_x^a \sigma_x^b) + E_\rho(\sigma_z^a \sigma_z^b)| \leq 1. \tag{6}$$

Immediately, we have $tr[\rho\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b] + tr[\rho\sigma_z^a\sigma_z^b] = 2tr[\rho(|\Phi^+\rangle\langle\Phi^+| - |\Psi^-\rangle\langle\Psi^-|)]$. Here, $|\Phi^+\rangle = \frac{|+^a+^b\rangle+|-^a-^b\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$. Therefore, if (6) is violated, we have $\langle\Phi^+|\rho|\Phi^+\rangle > \frac{1}{2}$ or $\langle\Psi^-|\rho|\Psi^-\rangle > \frac{1}{2}$. Hence, the fidelity ($> 1/2$) to the EPR state ($|\Phi^+\rangle$ or $|\Psi^-\rangle$) is established. Let us introduce $\vec{x}$ and $\vec{z}$ such that $\vec{x} \cdot \sigma^a = \sigma_x^a$, $\vec{z} \cdot \sigma^a = \sigma_z^a$, $\vec{x} \cdot \sigma^b = \sigma_x^b$, and $\vec{z} \cdot \sigma^b = \sigma_z^b$. Let T be

$$T = tr[\rho\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b] + tr[\rho\sigma_z^a\sigma_z^b]. \tag{7}$$

Please notice the upper bound of $|T|$ is 1 when ρ is any separable state [15]. On substituting (3) into (7) and performing some algebra we find that

$$\begin{aligned} T = &\int p(n^a, n^b) dn^a dn^b \\ &((\vec{x} \cdot n^a)(\vec{x} \cdot n^b) + (\vec{z} \cdot n^a)(\vec{z} \cdot n^b)). \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

This leads us to the original form of the BBM inequality. Thereby, we see that the BBM inequality is a distillable entanglement witness inequality.

In what follows, we shall show that violations of (1) and of (6) give explicit sufficient conditions to refute the KS type of realism. The KS realism is equivalent the following situation: all quantum observables commute simultaneously [13].

Let us consider a classical probability space $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu_\rho)$, where Ω is a nonempty sample space, Σ is an algebra of subsets of Ω, and μ_ρ is a normalized measure on Σ such that $\mu_\rho(\Omega) = 1$. The subscript ρ expresses the following meaning: the probability measure μ_ρ is determined uniquely when a candidate state ρ is specified.

Let us introduce realistic functions (classical random variables) $f(o, \omega)$ onto Ω. Here o is an observable and $\omega \in \Omega$ is a hidden variable. One may assume that the possible values of $f(o, \omega)$ are eigenvalues of corresponding observable o. One may, also, assume the probability measure μ_ρ is chosen such that the following relation is valid:

$$tr[\rho o] = E_\rho(o) = \int_{\omega \in \Omega} \mu_\rho(d\omega) f(o, \omega) \tag{9}$$

for every observable o. Please notice these two assumptions for the realistic functions f and for the probability measure μ_ρ do not disturb the KS argument [16].

The KS theorem states one can not construct the realistic functions in the Hilbert space formalism of quantum theory in the KS manner. In more detail, the KS paradox is derived if we assume (i) realistic functions exist, and (ii) the product rule holds. The product rule is as follows: when observables o_1 and o_2 commute, then

$$f(o_1, \omega) f(o_2, \omega) = f(o_1 \times o_2, \omega). \tag{10}$$

Given observables σ_x^a, σ_y^a, σ_z^a, σ_x^b, σ_y^b, σ_z^b, $\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b$, $\sigma_y^a\sigma_y^b$, $\sigma_x^a\sigma_y^b$, $\sigma_y^a\sigma_x^b$, and $\sigma_z^a\sigma_z^b$, we assume that there exist realistic functions $f(\sigma_x^a, \omega)$, $f(\sigma_y^a, \omega)$, $f(\sigma_z^a, \omega)$, $f(\sigma_x^b, \omega)$, $f(\sigma_y^b, \omega)$, $f(\sigma_z^b, \omega)$, $f(\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b, \omega)$, $f(\sigma_y^a\sigma_y^b, \omega)$, $f(\sigma_x^a\sigma_y^b, \omega)$, $f(\sigma_y^a\sigma_x^b, \omega)$, and $f(\sigma_z^a\sigma_z^b, \omega)$. Please notice that the possible values of each of realistic functions f are ± 1. In the following, we shall construct the inequality-form-statistical KS theorem. To simplify the discussion, we assume that (10) holds in every hidden variable ω. (See [16] for more complicated discussion). And we shall prove that each of violations of the Ekert inequality and of the BBM inequality provides explicit sufficient conditions for the KS refutation of realism. Let us consider the three cases.

Case (I):(the case of $\langle\Psi^+|\rho|\Psi^+\rangle > \frac{1}{2}$). Let x, y be real numbers with $x, y \in \{-1, +1\}$. Then we have

$$(1 + x + y - xy) = \pm 2. \tag{11}$$

The (11) says $U_1(\omega) = 1 + f(\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b,\omega) + f(\sigma_y^a\sigma_y^b,\omega) - f(\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b,\omega)f(\sigma_y^a\sigma_y^b,\omega) \Rightarrow U_1(\omega) = \pm 2$ and

$$E_\rho(U_1) = \int_{\omega\in\Omega} \mu_\rho(d\omega)U_1(\omega) \leq 2. \tag{12}$$

We can factorize two of the terms as $f(\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b) = f(\sigma_x^a)f(\sigma_x^b)$ and $f(\sigma_y^a\sigma_y^b) = f(\sigma_y^a)f(\sigma_y^b)$. Further, we have $f(\sigma_x^a\sigma_y^b) = f(\sigma_x^a)f(\sigma_y^b)$ and $f(\sigma_y^a\sigma_x^b) = f(\sigma_y^a)f(\sigma_x^b)$. Hence we get $f(\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b)f(\sigma_y^a\sigma_y^b) = f(\sigma_x^a\sigma_y^b)f(\sigma_y^a\sigma_x^b)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &f(\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b,\omega)f(\sigma_y^a\sigma_y^b,\omega) = f(\sigma_x^a\sigma_y^b,\omega)f(\sigma_y^a\sigma_x^b,\omega) \\ &= f(\sigma_z^a\sigma_z^b,\omega). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Hence we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\omega\in\Omega} \mu_\rho(d\omega)U_1(\omega) \leq 2 \\ &\Leftrightarrow 1 + tr[\rho\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b] + tr[\rho\sigma_y^a\sigma_y^b] - tr[\rho\sigma_z^a\sigma_z^b] \leq 2. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

The violation of the inequality (14) implies that one can not introduce the realistic functions satisfying the product rule (10) in the candidate state ρ. The relation (14) rewritten as $tr[\rho|\Psi^+\rangle\langle\Psi^+|] \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore the violation of (1), because of $\langle\Psi^+|\rho|\Psi^+\rangle > \frac{1}{2}$, is a sufficient condition for certification of the KS theorem.

Case (II):(the case of $\langle\Psi^-|\rho|\Psi^-\rangle > \frac{1}{2}$). Note the following relation:

$$(1 - x - y - xy) = \pm 2. \tag{15}$$

The (15) says $U_2(\omega) = 1 - f(\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b,\omega) - f(\sigma_y^a\sigma_y^b,\omega) - f(\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b,\omega)f(\sigma_y^a\sigma_y^b,\omega) \Rightarrow U_2(\omega) = \pm 2$ and $E_\rho(U_2) \leq 2$. Similar to the Case (I), we have $f(\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b,\omega)f(\sigma_y^a\sigma_y^b,\omega) = f(\sigma_x^a\sigma_y^b,\omega)f(\sigma_y^a\sigma_x^b,\omega) = f(\sigma_z^a\sigma_z^b,\omega)$. Hence we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} &E_\rho(U_2) \leq 2 \\ &\Leftrightarrow 1 - tr[\rho\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b] - tr[\rho\sigma_y^a\sigma_y^b] - tr[\rho\sigma_z^a\sigma_z^b] \leq 2. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

The violation of the inequality (16) implies that one can not introduce the realistic functions satisfying the product rule (10) in the candidate state ρ. The relation (16) rewritten as $tr[\rho|\Psi^-\rangle\langle\Psi^-|] \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore each of violations of (1) and of (6), because of $\langle\Psi^-|\rho|\Psi^-\rangle > \frac{1}{2}$, is a sufficient condition for certification of the KS theorem.

Case (III):(the case of $\langle\Phi^+|\rho|\Phi^+\rangle > \frac{1}{2}$). Note the following relation:

$$(1 + x - y + xy) = \pm 2. \tag{17}$$

The (17) says $U_3(\omega) = 1 + f(\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b,\omega) - f(\sigma_y^a\sigma_y^b,\omega) + f(\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b,\omega)f(\sigma_y^a\sigma_y^b,\omega) \Rightarrow U_3(\omega) = \pm 2$ and $E_\rho(U_3) \leq 2$. Similar to the Case (I), we have $f(\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b,\omega)f(\sigma_y^a\sigma_y^b,\omega) = f(\sigma_x^a\sigma_y^b,\omega)f(\sigma_y^a\sigma_x^b,\omega) = f(\sigma_z^a\sigma_z^b,\omega)$. Hence we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} &E_\rho(U_3) \leq 2 \\ &\Leftrightarrow 1 + tr[\rho\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b] - tr[\rho\sigma_y^a\sigma_y^b] + tr[\rho\sigma_z^a\sigma_z^b] \leq 2. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

The violation of the inequality (18) implies that one can not introduce the realistic functions satisfying the product rule (10) in the candidate state ρ. The relation (18) rewritten as $tr[\rho|\Phi^+\rangle\langle\Phi^+|] \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore the violation of (6), because of $\langle\Phi^+|\rho|\Phi^+\rangle > \frac{1}{2}$, is a sufficient condition for certification of the KS theorem.

Hence, we have, completely, proven that each of violations of the Ekert inequality and of the BBM inequality provides explicit sufficient conditions for the KS refutation of realism via the existence of the candidate state ρ and inequalities (14), (16), and (18).

Assume the inequalities (14) and (16) are valid simultaneously, introducing an arbitrary candidate state ρ. Then, we have $\langle\Psi^+|\rho|\Psi^+\rangle \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\langle\Psi^-|\rho|\Psi^-\rangle \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Hence the Ekert inequality must be satisfied. Therefore, the inequalities (14) and (16) give a sufficient condition to satisfy the Ekert inequality. Now, assume the inequalities (16) and (18) are valid simultaneously. Then, we have $\langle\Phi^+|\rho|\Phi^+\rangle \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\langle\Psi^-|\rho|\Psi^-\rangle \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Hence the BBM inequality must be satisfied. Therefore, the inequalities (16) and (18) give a sufficient condition to satisfy the BBM inequality. This means that the violation of the Ekert and BBM inequalities is impossible if the KS type of realism is valid in the Hilbert space formalism of quantum theory. In other words, if one certifies the success in each QKD scheme, one certifies the KS refutation of realism.

Now, assume that we abandon the product rule. And we introduce locality condition (Bell's locality condition) instead of the KS condition (the product rule). Bell's locality condition is expressed by the fact that the realistic functions for Alice is independent of Bob's ones and vice versa. When there is it, one can construct explicitly a local realistic model for given correlation functions [17]. Even in the case, the violation of the Ekert and of the BBM inequalities is possible as shown below.

Imagine the candidate state ρ is the EPR state $|\Psi^-\rangle\langle\Psi^-|$. Then we have $tr[\rho\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b] = -1$, $tr[\rho\sigma_z^a\sigma_z^b] = -1$, $tr[\rho\sigma_x^a\sigma_z^b] = 0$, and $tr[\rho\sigma_z^a\sigma_x^b] = 0$. The set of correlation functions is described with the property that they are reproducible by local realistic theory. See the following relations along with the arguments in [17]

$$\begin{aligned} &|tr[\rho\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b] - tr[\rho\sigma_z^a\sigma_z^b] + tr[\rho\sigma_x^a\sigma_z^b] + tr[\rho\sigma_z^a\sigma_x^b]| \leq 2 \\ &|tr[\rho\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b] + tr[\rho\sigma_z^a\sigma_z^b] - tr[\rho\sigma_x^a\sigma_z^b] + tr[\rho\sigma_z^a\sigma_x^b]| \leq 2 \\ &|tr[\rho\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b] + tr[\rho\sigma_z^a\sigma_z^b] + tr[\rho\sigma_x^a\sigma_z^b] - tr[\rho\sigma_z^a\sigma_x^b]| \leq 2 \\ &|tr[\rho\sigma_x^a\sigma_x^b] - tr[\rho\sigma_z^a\sigma_z^b] - tr[\rho\sigma_x^a\sigma_z^b] - tr[\rho\sigma_z^a\sigma_x^b]| \leq 2. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

But, the set of correlation functions produces the violation of the BBM inequality (6).

Now, imagine the candidate state ρ is another EPR state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ with $|\psi\rangle = \frac{|+^a-^b\rangle + e^{-i(\pi/4)}|-^a+^b\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$. Then we have $tr[\rho a_1 b_1] = 1$, $tr[\rho a_3 b_3] = 1$, $tr[\rho a_1 b_3] = 0$, and $tr[\rho a_3 b_1] = 0$. (Please note $a_1 = \sigma_x^a$, $a_3 = \sigma_y^a$, $b_1 = \frac{\sigma_y^b + \sigma_x^b}{\sqrt{2}}$, and $b_3 = \frac{\sigma_y^b - \sigma_x^b}{\sqrt{2}}$). The set of correlation functions is, also, described with the property that they

are reproducible by local realistic theory. See the following relations,

$$\begin{aligned}
|tr[\rho a_1 b_1] - tr[\rho a_3 b_3] + tr[\rho a_1 b_3] + tr[\rho a_3 b_1]| \leq 2 \\
|tr[\rho a_1 b_1] + tr[\rho a_3 b_3] - tr[\rho a_1 b_3] + tr[\rho a_3 b_1]| \leq 2 \\
|tr[\rho a_1 b_1] + tr[\rho a_3 b_3] + tr[\rho a_1 b_3] - tr[\rho a_3 b_1]| \leq 2 \\
|tr[\rho a_1 b_1] - tr[\rho a_3 b_3] - tr[\rho a_1 b_3] - tr[\rho a_3 b_1]| \leq 2.
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

But, the set of correlation functions produces the violation of the Ekert inequality (1).

The explicit difference between the KS condition (the product rule) and Bell's locality condition onto the realistic functions f in the Hilbert space formalism of quantum theory is thus laid bare.

In summary, we have constructed explicitly three inequalities as tests for the KS theorem. A set of two of those provides a sufficient condition to satisfy the Ekert inequality. Another set of two of those provides a sufficient condition to satisfy the BBM inequality. Therefore, it turned out that (1) the violation of the Ekert inequality is a sufficient condition for certification of the KS theorem, and (2) the violation of the BBM inequality is, also, a sufficient condition for certification of the KS theorem. Therefore the success in each QKD protocol reveals the nonclassical feature of quantum theory, in the sense that the KS realism is violated. This means that quantum observables must be non-commutative if one wants the success in these EPR-type-QKD protocols (Ekert 91 and BBM 92). Further, it turned out that both (Ekert and BBM) inequalities are distillable entanglement witness inequalities. Thereby we connect the success in each of QKD processes into the no-hidden-variables theorem and into the confirmation of distillable entanglement. And we have shown that the violation of the Ekert and BBM inequalities in each of QKD protocols does not, in general, violate Bell's local realism.

As the BB84 scheme is essentially equivalent to the BBM scheme, it is very interesting to research the relation between the security of the BB84 scheme [1, 2] and the KS condition, which leads us to stronger refutation of realism in the formalism of quantum theory than those revealed by Bell's locality condition.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank M. Sasaki, M. Takeoka, and M. Koashi for valuable discussions.

[1] P. W. Shor and J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 441 (2000).
[2] M. Koashi and J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 057902 (2003).
[3] A. Acín, L. Masanes, and N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 167901 (2003).
[4] A. Acín and N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 020501 (2005).
[5] M. Curty, M. Lewenstein, and N. Lütkenhaus, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 217903 (2004).
[6] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
[7] A. Galind and M. A. Martín-Delgado, Rev. Mod. Phys. **74**, 347 (2002).
[8] A. K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 661 (1991).
[9] J. S. Bell, Physics **1**, 195 (1964).
[10] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, and N. D. Mermin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 557 (1992).
[11] K. Nagata, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 064101 (2002).
[12] S. Kochen and E. P. Specker, J. Math. Mech. **17**, 59 (1967).
[13] Local realistic functions (classical random variables) are represented by non-commutative operators in the Hilbert space formalism of quantum theory. See, A. Yu. Khrennikov, Phys. Lett. A **316**, 279 (2003). On the other hand, the KS condition (the product rule) and the uniqueness feature of Gleason's theorem imply that all quantum operators commute simultaneously. See, J. D. Malley, quant-ph/0402126.
[14] K. Nagata, M. Koashi, and N. Imoto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 260401 (2002).
[15] K. Nagata, M. Koashi, and N. Imoto, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 042314 (2002).
[16] K. Nagata, quant-ph/0312052.
[17] A. Fine, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 291 (1982); A. Fine, J. Math. Phys. **23**, 1306 (1982).